



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/633,089	08/04/00	WALLACE	R HARI.149US0

MM91/0829
MAJESTIC PARSONS SIEBERT & HSUE PC
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 1100
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4106

EXAMINER

LE, U

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED:

08/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,089

Applicant(s)

WALLACE ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 24 October 2000 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered except for those U.S. patents, which can be readily retrieved by the Examiner.

Drawings

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings, which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 16, 18, 20 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claims 1, line 2: Substitute "the card" with -- the electronic card --.

Re claims 3, line 1: Substitute "the card" with -- the electronic card --.

Re claims 3, line 2: Substitute "the electrical signal interface" with -- an electrical signal interface --.

Re claims 3, line 2: Delete "its".

Re claims 5, line 1: Substitute "the card" with -- the electronic card --.

Re claims 5, line 2: Substitute "the electrical signal interface" with -- an electrical signal interface --.

Re claims 5, line 2: Delete "its".

Re claims 6, line 1: Substitute "the card" with -- the electronic card --.

Re claim 16, line 8: Substitute "the first memory card" with -- the first electronic card --.

Re claims 18, line 2: Substitute "the electrical signal interface" with -- an electrical signal interface --.

Re claims 18, line 2: Delete "its".

Re claims 3 and 18, line 1: The addition of the word "omits" to an otherwise definite expression extends the scope of the expression so as to render it negative interpretation.

Appropriate correction is required.

Re claims 20, line 2: Substitute "the electrical signal interface" with -- an electrical signal interface --.

Re claims 20, line 2: Delete "its".

Re claim 22, line 11: Substitute " a memory card" with -- the memory card --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-9 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Le Roux (US 5,486,687).

Re claims 1-9 and 16-21, Le Roux discloses an electronic card that is removably insertable into a receptacle 30, which makes electrical contact with contacts 16 on the card; a first published card standard 10, which is a SD card; a second published card standard 18, which is an ISO 7816 standard (col. 3, lines 25-31; an electrical signal interface at the contacts 16, through which a security code can be accessed; wherein the first card 10 includes electronic functions and an electrical interface according to the second standard card that are distinct from electronic function and an electrical interface of the first card standard (see figs. 1-4; col. 3, line 7 through col. 6, line 2).

6. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iwasaki et al (US 6,002,605).

Re claims 22-23, Iwasaki et al discloses an electronic device an electronic system; a stored security code; at least one receptacle into which at least a non-volatile memory card is removably insertable, a circuit 56 connected to the at least one receptacle to receive a security code from a first memory card 11 inserted into the at least one receptacle; another circuit 51 connected to the at least on receptacle to receive data from a second memory card 21 inserted into the at least one receptacle (see figs. 15A-B & 17; col. 13, lines 41-61 and col. 14, lines 16-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 10-15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Roux in view of Benezet (US 5,278,395) and Iwasaki et al. The teachings of Le Roux and Iwasaki have been discussed above.

Re claims 10-15 and 24, Le Roux have been discussed above but fails to teach or fairly suggest the method of removing the first card from the receptacle then inserting the second card.

Benezet teaches the above limitation in fig. 2 and col. 7, line 11 through col. 8, line 15; wherein the first card 10 has to be inserted and removed before inserting the second card 6.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Benezet into the teachings of Le Roux in order to provide Le Roux with a more secure system, wherein the two cards are required to be inserted in a first and the second sequential order to operate the system. Furthermore, such modification would have provided Le Roux with a feasible system (i.e., only one receptacle is needed to accommodate two cards rather than to provide two dedicated receptacle with two separate processors). Accordingly, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Le Roux for a more compact and feasible system, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Le Roux as modified by Benezet fails to teach or fairly suggest that the data inputted to the electronic device include audio data that is utilized by a sound system within the device to generate sounds, wherein the sounds include music.

Iwasaki et al teaches the above limitation in col. 16, lines 17-46.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Iwasaki et al into the teachings of Le

Roux/Benezet in order to provide Le Roux/Benezet with a universal system, in which the operator has a greater flexibility in storing and for retrieving information in a plurality of formats (e.g., audio data, video data or digital code data, etc...), and thus providing a user friendly system. Accordingly, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Le Roux/Benezet, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Le Roux/Benezet as modified by Iwasaki et al fails to teach or fairly suggest that the system including an audio unit for installation in a vehicle.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a conventional audio unit into the teachings of Le Roux/Benezet/Iwasaki et al in order to provide Le Roux/Benezet/Iwasaki et al with a more user-friendly system device wherein the operator would receive audio information/data that is pertinent to the operator. Therefore, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Le Roux/Benezet/Iwasaki et al, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to MacKenthun (US 6,073,855); Le Roux et al (US 6,216,955); Bergeron et al (US 4,882,473); Storck et al (US 5,434,395); Ohki et al (US 6,000,607); Abe et al (US 5,895,903); Itou et al (US 6,010,066); Aucsmith (US 5,936,226); Klatt et al (US 5,877,488); and Watanabe (US 4,709,136) are cited as of interest and illustrate a similar structure to the use of small electronic circuit cards with different interfaces in an electronic system.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and TR-F 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-4783 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.


Uyen-Chau N. Le

August 27, 2001


MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800